

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

KENNETH HAMILTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 3:18-cv-00577-JPG-RJD

VENERIO SANTOS,

Defendant.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

J. PHIL GILBERT, DISTRICT JUDGE

Magistrate Judge Reona J. Daly has issued a Report and Recommendations (“Report”) on the defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (ECF Nos. 38, 32.) The Court may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations of the magistrate judge in her Report. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). The Court must review *de novo* the portions of the report to which objections are made. *Id.* “If no objection or only partial objection is made, the district court judge reviews those unobjected portions for clear error.” *Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999).

Here, plaintiff Kenneth Hamilton did not file a timely objection to the Report. Magistrate Judge Daly warned him on May 22, 2019 that he had to object within fourteen days of service. But Hamilton did not mail his objection until June 11, 2019, and the Court did not receive it until June 14, 2019—and the reasons Hamilton offers in his motion for an extension of time do not warrant such an extension. (See ECF No. 39.) Accordingly, Magistrate Judge Daly’s Report withstands a clear error review, and the Court:

- **ADOPTS** the Report in its entirety (ECF No. 38);
- **GRANTS** the defendants’ motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 32);

- **DENIES** Hamilton's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 39);
- **DISMISSES** this case **WITH PREJUDICE**; and
- **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: JUNE 25, 2019

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE